APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,543	02/20/2004	Stephen Cutler	CUTCP0103US	7433

23908   7590   03/15/2011
RENNER OTTO BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP
1621 EUCLID AVENUE
NINETEENTH FLOOR
CLEVELAND, OH 44115

EXAMINER
ORR, HENRY W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2175	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/15/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 January 2011</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1,4,12-14,16-28,35-37,40-46,48-50,52-64,71,72,93 and 94</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1, 4, 12-14, 16-28,35-37,40-46,48-50,52-64,71,72, 93 and 94</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to applicant's amendment dated 1/6/2011.

2.   Claims 1, 4-10, 12-14, 16-28, 35-37, 40-46, 48-50, 52-64, 71, 72, 93 and 94.

3.   Claims 93 and 94 are newly added.

4.   Claims 1, 37, 75, 77, 79 and 86, 93 and 94 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4-10, 12-14, 16, 17, 26, 35-46, 48-50, 52, 53, 62, 71 and 72 are

rejected 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Dauerer et al. ("Dauerer"),

Patent No. 5,841,435 in view of Stuple et al. (hereinafter "Stuple"), U.S. Patent No.

7,577,914 B1.

Claim 1:

Dauerer teaches a virtual display and a virtual windows desktop system (see

abstract) **(claim 1; i.e., a computer-readable medium storing a computer**

application workspace generation and navigation tool that comprises:) Examiner

interprets the virtual display to be the recited application workspace. Examiner interprets

the virtual windows desktop system to be capable of functioning as a navigation tool

(see col. 7 lines 19-42).

Dauerer teaches **computer code within a main computer application that generates a continuous logical main application workspace that is larger in size than a physically viewable operating system desktop work area displayed on a physical computer system display, the continuous logical main application workspace comprised of a plurality of logical screen areas** (see abstract, col. 4 lines 38-43, Figure 3)

Dauerer teaches **each logical screen has predetermined dimensions that are coextensive with the physically viewable work area on the physical computer system display such that each logical screen has dimensions that are the same as every other logical screen;** (see abstract, col. 2 lines 28-33, Figure 3)

Dauerer teaches that **the logical screens are arranged contiguously in predetermined locations in the logical main application workspace such that the logical main application workspace is a single and functionally continuous logical workspace that is larger in size than the physical computer system display used to display the physically viewable work area; each logical screen is individually selectable for navigation within the logical main application workspace; and computer code that moves, by user action, the logical main application workspace from an area displaying a currently displayed one of the logical screens in the physically viewable work area, the selected area of one of the logical screens being any user selected screen area in the logical main application workspace** (see abstract, col. 7 lines 29-41: "Discreet Physical Display Movement function", Figure 3).

Dauerer teaches **computer code that logically associates a plurality of sub-application windows with respective logical screens of within the logical main application workspace, the sub-application windows for displaying content of at least one open sub-application** (see col. 2 lines 23-26, col. 4 lines 33-35).

Dauerer teaches that the workspace can be any size (see col. 2 lines 15-22).

Dauerer fails to expressly teach automatically increasing the number of logical screens in response to a user action to moving a sub-application outside the workspace.

However, Stuple teaches automatically increasing the size of a workspace in response to data moving outside the workspace (see abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to modify the workspace of logical screens as taught by Dauerer to include an automated response to increase in size when data is moved outside the workspace as taught by Stuple to provide the benefit of accommodating the placement of data. **(claim 1; i.e., and that automatically increases the number of logical screens in response to a user action to move one of the sub-application windows to a new location outside dimensions of the continuous logical main application workspace.)**

Claim 4:

Dauerer teaches configuring the virtual display to any size (see col. 2 lines 41-45). **(claim 4; i.e., code that increases the number of logical screens automatically**

add logical screens in a number that is in excess of that needed to accommodate

the new location of the sub-application window)

Claim 5:

Dauerer's Figure 3 illustrates **code that logically associates each sub-**

application window location with a logical screen of the continuous main

application workspace in which a majority of the sub-application window is

disposed.

Claim 6:

Dauerer teaches **code that stores an arrangement of sub-application**

windows locations disposed within the logical main application workspace (see

col. 10 lines 3-13).

Claim 7:

Dauerer teaches **code that retrieves the stored arrangement of sub-**

application windows (see col. 10 lines 3-13).

Claim 8:

Dauerer teaches **code that stores a layout of the continuous logical main**

application workspace including a number and arrangement of logical screens

and relative location of each sub-application window within the continuous

logical application workspace (see col. 7 lines 43-51, col. 9 lines 8-10).

Claim 9:

Dauerer teaches **code that retrieves the stored layout** (see col. 7 lines 59-63).

Claim 10:

Dauerer teaches **code that scales the continuous application workspace and**

sub-application windows to zoom the application workspace in or out (see col. 5

lines 47-51, Figure 6).

Claim 12:

Dauerer teaches **code that, upon initiation of one of the sub-application**

windows, logically associates the sub-application window with a logical screen

within the continuous logical main application workspace identified by user

action (see col. 2 lines 51-60).

Claim 13:

Dauerer teaches **code to provide the user with a user moveable placement**

means, wherein the logical screen associated with a sub-application window

within the continuous logical main application workspace identified by user

action corresponds to a logical screen including location of the placement means relative to the continuous logical main application workspace (see col. 6 lines 20-29).

Claim 14:

Dauerer teaches **wherein the logical screens are contiguously arranged in a matrix** (see col. 4 lines 40-43, Figure 3).

Claim 16:

As explained in claim 1, Dauerer in view of Stuple teaches **code that increases the number of logical screens and a corresponding dimension of the continuous logical main application workspace matrix in accordance with the user action to move one of the sub-application windows to a new location outside the current dimensions of the continuous logical main application** (see Dauerer; col. 5 lines 40-46) (see Stuple; abstract).

Claim 17:

Dauerer teaches **code that decreases the number of logical screens and a corresponding dimension of the continuous logical main application workspace in accordance with a user action** (see col. 5 lines 40-46).

Claim 26:

Dauerer teaches **code that generates the logical application workspace generates a plurality of logical application workspaces for the main computer application** (see abstract).

Claim 35:

Dauerer teaches **wherein the placement means is a placement pointer having a position that defines the location within the continuous logical workspace identified by user action** (see col. 2 lines 51-60).

Claim 36:

Dauerer teaches **wherein the placement means is a placement tool for marking the location within the logical workspace identified by user action** (see col. 2 lines 51-60).

Claims 37, 40-46, 48-50, 52 and 53:

Claims 37, 41-46, 48-50, 52 and 53 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in manufacture claims 1, 4-10, 12-14, 16 and 17, respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected under the same rationale as manufacture claims 1, 4-10, 12-14, 16 and 17 above.

Claims 62, 71 and 72:

Claims 62, 71 and 72 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in

manufacture claims 26, 35, and 36 respectively; therefore the method claims are

rejected under the same rationale as manufacture claims 26, 35 and 36 above.

Claims 18-24, 54-60, 93 and 94 are rejected 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over by Dauerer et al. ("Dauerer"), Patent No. 5,841,435 in view of

Anderson et al. (hereinafter "Anderson"), U.S. Published Application No.

2003/0189597 A1.

Claim 18:

Dauerer teaches **a computer-readable medium storing a computer**

application workspace generation and navigation tool that comprises:) Examiner

interprets the virtual display to be the recited application workspace. Examiner interprets

the virtual windows desktop system to be capable of functioning as a navigation tool

(see col. 7 lines 19-42).

Dauerer teaches **computer code within a main computer application that**

generates a continuous logical main application workspace that is larger in size

than a physically viewable operating system desktop work area displayed on a

physical computer system display, the continuous logical main application

workspace comprised of a plurality of logical screen areas(see abstract, col. 4 lines

38-43, Figure 3)

Dauerer teaches **each logical screen has predetermined dimensions that are**

coextensive with the physically viewable work area on the physical computer

**system display such that each logical screen has dimensions that are the same
as every other logical screen;** (see abstract, col. 2 lines 28-33, Figure 3)

Dauerer teaches that **the logical screens are arranged contiguously in
predetermined locations in the logical main application workspace such that the
logical main application workspace is a single and functionally continuous logical
workspace that is larger in size than the physical computer system display used
to display the physically viewable work area; each logical screen is individually
selectable for navigation within the logical main application workspace; and
computer code that moves, by user action, the logical main application
workspace from an area displaying a currently displayed one of the logical
screens in the physically viewable work area, the selected area of one of the
logical screens being any user selected screen area in the logical main
application workspace** (see abstract, col. 7 lines 29-41: "Discreet Physical Display
Movement function", Figure 3).

Dauerer teaches **code that generates a navigation box that includes a
representation of the continuous logical main application workspace including an
indication of each logical screen within the workspace** (see col. 6 lines 20-29).
Examiner interprets the reduced virtual display as taught by Dauerer to anticipate the
recited navigation box of claim 18.

Dauerer fails to expressly teach simultaneously displaying a navigation box and physically viewable work area.

However, Anderson's Figure 11 illustrates simultaneously displaying a navigation box and physically viewable work area (see virtual desktop manager 400).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the logical workspace as taught by Dauerer to include a simultaneously displayed workspace manager (i.e., navigation box) as taught by Anderson to provide the benefit quickly switching between logical screens. **(claim 18; i.e., computer code that moves the physically viewable work area in the logical main application workspace from an area displaying a currently displayed one of the logical screens to an area displaying a logical screen selected by a user action from the navigation box; wherein the navigation box is displayed simultaneously in the physically viewable work area with one of the logical screens.)**

Claim 19:

Dauerer teaches **wherein the logical screen representations are arranged to have a topography corresponding to a topography of the logical screens** (see col. 6 lines 20-29).

Claim 20:

Dauerer teaches restoring the virtual display from the reduced virtual display (i.e.,
navigation box) (see col. 10 line 2).

Dauerer fails to expressly teach **in response to user selection of one of the
screen representations in the navigation box**, displays the corresponding screen on
the computer system display in the physically viewable work area defined by the main
computer application (emphasis added).

However, Anderson teaches **code that, in response to user selection of one
of the screen representations in the navigation box, displays the corresponding
screen on the computer system display in the physically viewable work area
defined by the main computer application, while maintaining the display of the
navigation box in the physically viewable work area** (see Figure 11-maintaining the
display of navigation box, par. 5-6; Each button 110-116 may be clicked using a
pointing device, such as a mouse, to bring up a virtual desktop associated with the
clicked button.). Examiner interprets a button to represent a reduced logical screen of a
virtual desktop.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was to modify the logical screen of the reduced virtual display as taught by
Dauerer to respond to a mouse click to bring up a virtual desktop as taught by Anderson
to provide the benefit of quickly visiting the virtual desktop once a user has recognize
the desired reduced virtual desktop screen (see Anderson; par. 5-6).

Claim 21:

As explained in claim 18, Dauerer in view of Anderson teaches **code that logically associates a plurality of sub-application windows with respective locations within the continuous logical main application workspace, the sub-application windows for displaying content of at least one sub-application, and code that displays an iconic representation of each sub-application window in association with the representation of the logically associated screen** (see col. 2 lines 23-26, col. 4 lines 33-35, Figure 3).

Claim 22:

Dauerer's Figure 3 illustrates **code that logically associates each sub-application window with a logical screen in which a majority of the sub-application window is disposed**.

Claim 23:

Dauerer teaches **code that moves a user selected sub-application window from a logically associated screen to another logical screen in response to user initiated movement of the corresponding iconic representation of the sub-application window in the navigation box** (see col. 9 lines 51-56). Examiner notes

that the reduced virtual display as illustrated in Dauerer's Figure 6 may be interpreted as the recited navigation box.

Dauerer's Figure 1 illustrates **wherein the sub-application window is moved without changing the display of the currently displayed logical screen within the physically viewable work area.** Examiner notes that the sub-application window claimed is not necessarily the sub-application previously user selected.

Claim 24:

Dauerer teaches **code that displays information relating to one of the sub-application windows in response to user action in connection with the iconic representation of the one of the sub-application windows in the navigation box application** (see col. 6 lines 30-40; user authorizing display of content of the sub application windows).

Claim 93:

Claim 93 is substantially encompassed in claims 18 and 23; therefore the claim is rejected under the same rationale as claims 18 and 23 above.

Claim 94:

Claims 94 is substantially encompassed in claims 18 and 23; therefore the claim is rejected under the same rationale as claims 18 and 23 above.

Claims 25, 27, 28, 61, 63, and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dauerer in view of Stuple as cited above, in further view of Anderson as cited above.

Claim 25:

Anderson illustrates a panel **from which a user can select one of the plurality of logical screens for display in the physically viewable work area defined by the main computer application** (see Figure 1C).

Dauerer/Stuple/ Anderson fail to expressly teach a drop down menu for performing the same function.

However, Examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art (i.e., computer programmer) at the time the invention was made to substitute the panel as taught by Anderson with a conventional drop-down menu. In other words, the drop down menu is merely a design choice chosen by the Applicant and does not patentably distinguish over the Anderson reference. (**claim 25; code that provides a drop down menu from which a user can select one of the plurality of logical screens for display on the computer system display in the physically viewable work area defined by the main computer application)**

Claim 27:

Dauerer in view of Stuple fail to expressly teach each logical screen associated

with a unique identifying feature.

However, Anderson teaches **wherein each logical screen is associated with a**

unique identifying feature (see par. 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the logical screens of the virtual display as taught by

Dauerer in view of Stuple to include a unique identifying feature as taught by Anderson

to provide the benefit of helping the user distinguish between the plurality of virtual

desktop screens (see Anderson; par. 9-10).

Claim 28:

Dauerer fails to expressly teach each logical screen associated with a unique

identifying feature.

However, Anderson teaches **wherein the unique identifying feature is**

selected from a background color, a background pattern and a combination

thereof (see par. 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the logical screens of the virtual display as taught by

Dauerer in view of Stuple to include a unique identifying feature as taught by Anderson

to provide the benefit of helping the user distinguish between the plurality of virtual

desktop screens (see par. 9-10).

Claims 61, 63 and 64:

Claims 61, 63 and 64 are a method claims and are substantially encompassed in manufacture claims 25, 27 and 28, respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected under the same rationale as manufacture claims 25, 27 and 28 above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4, 12-14, 16-28, 35-37, 40-46, 48-50, 52-64, 71, 72, 93 and 94 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Furthermore, Examiner encourages Applicant to amend "the sub-application window" to "the <u>user selected</u> sub-application window" as recited in claims 93 and 94 and to include within claims 93 and 94 claim language describing how the navigation box and physical view work area are simultaneously displayed in effort to advance prosecution.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to HENRY ORR whose telephone number is (571)270-

1308. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on (571) 272-4088. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

3/9/2011
HO

/Adam L Basehoar/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178